

REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed April 19, 2010. This response is timely. Any fee due with this paper, including any necessary extension fees, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Summary

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 were examined.

By the foregoing, claim 1 amended; new claims 13-15 are presented. No new matter has been added. The claims are well supported by at least the specification as filed. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as being indefinite for failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the rejection avers that the limitation in step (h) requiring the first layer not to include a second granular material is not supported by the specification.

Step (h) reads *"(h) finishing the dual-layer slab wherein the first layer does not comprise the second granular material."* In step (d), independent claim 1 recites *"the second granular material being a light-weight expanded inorganic granular material"* as is now recited.

The specification teaches an example at 7:06 et al. Therein,

<u>Composition (% by volume) of the visible thin layer:</u>	
Polymer resin:	18%
Fine quartz dust:	22%
Quartz granular material, 0.1-2.5 mm:	60%
<u>Composition (% by volume) of the light thick layer:</u>	
Polymer resin:	18%
Fine cristobalite powder:	18%
Expanded glass in granules of 0.2-4.0 mm:	64%

That is, the visible thin layer has a plurality of ingredients that add up to 100% by volume. None of those ingredients is a light weight expanded inorganic granular material as is now recited. As taught in the specification 5:02-07 (corresponds to ¶0037), the preferred embodiment is one where the expanded inorganic granular material is an expanded glass or clay. Returning to the embodiment taught in the table, expanded glass, makes up 64% of the light-thick layer, i.e., second layer, but none is indicated for the visible side. Applicant respectfully submits that the specification teaches the presently claimed invention within the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections.

All dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper, including any necessary extension fees, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hassan A. Shakir/
Hassan A. Shakir
Reg. No. 53,922
212.940.6489

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Docket No.: SAIC 22.355 (100788-00110)